



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,452	07/02/2007	Peter Mulleijans	2003048-US	1473
69289	7590	03/03/2011		
COLOPLAST A/S			EXAMINER	
Attention: Corporate Patents			CHAPMAN, GINGER T	
Holtedam 1				
DK-3050 Humleback,			ART UNIT	
DENMARK			PAPER NUMBER	
			3761	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			03/03/2011	
			ELECTRONIC	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent@coloplast.com  
dkbvd@coloplast.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/591,452

**Applicant(s)**

MULLEJANS ET AL.

**Examiner**

Ginger T. Chapman

**Art Unit**

3761

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 December 2010 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Status of the Claims**

#### **Drawings**

The drawings were received on 13 December 2010. These drawings are acceptable.

#### **Withdrawn objections:**

The objection to claim 8 for informalities, made of record in the previous Office action, is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendment to the claim.

The objection to the drawings for not including a reference sign, made of record in the previous Office action, is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendment to the Figures.

#### **Withdrawn rejections:**

The rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, made of record in the previous Office action, is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendment to the claim.

### **Response to Arguments**

Applicant's arguments filed 13 December 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues the following:

I) Claim 1 is amended to recite the limitations that the filter is integrated with the coupling system such that a filter inlet of the filter is inside the drainage bag and the foam is configured to displace faeces away from the filter inlet of the filter.

II) Ferguson does not teach a filter integrated with a coupling system such that a filter inlet is inside the drainage bag, as now required by independent claim 1.

III) The Office action interprets Broida as teaching a filter arranged between a coupling system and a drainage bag however Applicant asserts that the pad of Broida is a leakage

preventing pad positioned around aperture 22 of flange 23, and no portion of the pad is inside the drainage bag as now recited in claim 1, and thus the pad of Broida would fail to prevent liquid and solid particles from passing from the drainage bag to its surrounds as the filter of amended claim 1.

IV) Applicant argues that Petersen discloses filter 36 in recess 34 off flange 10 and no portion of the filter is exposed inside the drainage bag.

These arguments are not persuasive for the following reasons:

I & II) With respect to the present amendment reciting the location of the filter is integrated with the coupling system such that a filter inlet of the filter is inside the drainage bag, this argument is drawn to the claims as amended and is answered in detail in the rejection of the claims below; however, the examiner notes that the inlet of the filter of Ferguson is inside the drainage bag, thus Ferguson meets this claim limitation. See Ferguson at Figure 6 (80, 82), column 4, lines 55-61; column 5, lines 7-15.

With respect to the location of the filter being integral with the coupling system, the examiner notes that Ferguson discloses the structure of the ostomy system including drainage bag, coupling system, filter comprising foam and configured to displace faeces as claimed wherein the only difference is the location of the filter which Ferguson discloses as integral with the drainage bag instead of with the coupling system as now specifically claimed. Thus Ferguson discloses all of the structural elements claimed in the present ostomy system wherein the only difference between the prior art and the claims at issue is the location of the filter, however the filter of Ferguson performs the substantially identical claimed function of preventing liquid and solid particles from passing from the drainage bag and the foam of the

filter defining a passageway for releasing flatus gases from the bag to its surroundings, and as more fully detailed below in the rejection of the claims, based on the teachings of Ferguson and Petersen, it would be within the ordinary skill of a routine worker in the art to modify the ostomy system of Ferguson to locate the filter integral with the coupling system as taught by Petersen with a reasonable expectation of success and with no change in their respective functions since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70.

III) With respect to Broida, the examiner notes that Broida was not applied in the rejection of claim 1, Broida was cited with respect to claims 5 and 10 reciting the location of the filter is between the coupling system and the drainage bag is connected the filter flange along an attachment zone displaced radially with to a contact area. Broida is not applied for teaching a portion of the pad inside in the bag, therefore this argument is not persuasive with respect to the limitations recited in claim 1.

IV) With respect to Petersen, Applicants' argument that no portion of the filter 36 of Petersen is exposed inside the drainage bag is not persuasive because this argument is narrower than the claim language and thus is not commensurate in scope with claim 1 because the claim does not recite that a portion of the filter is inside of the drainage bag, the claim recites that "a filter inlet of the filter is inside the drainage bag". As best depicted in Figure 5 at (28) and at column 5, lines 31-41, Petersen teaches the filter inlet openings 28, 30, 32 are inside the drainage bag 40 so that flatus gas can enter the inlets from the interior of the bag in order to be vented from the interior of the bag to its surroundings. Therefore this argument is not persuasive because the claims as presently written only require that the filter inlet is inside the drainage bag,

the claims as presently written do not require a portion of the filter itself to be inside the drainage bag.

Therefore the examiner respectfully traverses Applicants arguments and maintains the art rejections of the rejected claims as detailed below.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

- 1) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 2) The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson et al (US 5,306,264) in view of Petersen (US 4,826,495).

**With respect to claim 1**, as best depicted in Figures 3, 5 and 6, Ferguson discloses an ostomy system for receiving bodily waste, comprising:

a drainage bag 10 (figs. 1 and 2);

a coupling system 30 configured to secure the drainage bag 10 to a stoma 28 of a user (column 3, lines 43-50);

at least one filter 40 (fig. 3 at 10) comprising a foam 44, 70 (column 3, lines 61-63 and column 4, lines 20-21) for preventing liquid and solid particles from passing from the drainage bag to its surroundings (column 5, lines 4-6 and lines 23-27; column 6, lines 64-68 to column 7, lines 1-4), the foam 44 defining a passageway for releasing flatus gasses from the drainage bag to the surroundings (column 4, lines 62-67; column 5, lines 16-18; column 6, lines 54-63);

wherein the filter is integrated with the drainage bag 10 such that a filter inlet 80, 82 (Figure 6) of the filter 40 is inside the drainage bag 10 (column 4, lines 55-61; column 5, lines 7-23) and

the foam 70 is configured to displace faeces away from the filter inlet 80 of the filter in response to folding of the drainage bag during use (column 5, lines 2-6 disclosing that the motion of the body of the wearer results in breaking and reforming of the tension bubbles thereby providing a path for the gas to travel and faeces thereby does not clog or enter the filter, if the faeces is prevented from clogging the surface of the filter and prevented from entering the filter, it is necessarily displaced away from the filter inlet as the flatus gas is entering the inlet, otherwise the gas would be prevented from entering the inlet by faeces at the inlet.

With respect to the limitation of folding of the drainage bag during use of the bag, the bag of Ferguson is comprised as the same flexible material as the instant bag and thus will fold or flex or bend in response to the wearer's body motion in the substantially identical manner as the instant bag. The examiner notes that the instant Specification, in particular at PG-Publication paragraphs [0010, 0014, 0019, 0037-8], Figures 4A and 6, indicates that the "folding" occurring at a "folding line" occurs naturally by folding of the bag caused by the wearer's movements, i.e. when the user sits, lies down, stands up or generally moves about, the motion of the wearer

causes the bag to fold naturally with the wearer's movements, that one or more folding lines can occur along any parts of the bag that caused by wearer movements; and thus the folding along any folding lines is not a structural component of the pouch since the pouch can be folded along any number of lines caused by the bag moving in response to the movements of the wearer.

The instant Specification states that folding lines often intersect the areas located about the coupling system or the inner bag where the pouch is attached to the wearer. Ferguson discloses the filter located about the coupling system and the inner bag, Ferguson, at column 5, lines 2-4, discloses that the body motion by the wearer acts upon the filter in the same manner as disclosed in the instant Specification at [0010], and thus discloses that at least a portion of the foam is arranged at a folding line defined by the drainage bag during use thereof and thus meets the claim.

Ferguson discloses the claimed invention except for the filter is integrated with the coupling system. Ferguson discloses that the filter is integrated with the drainage bag such that a filter inlet 80, 82 (Figure 6) of the filter is inside the drainage bag in order to permit flatus gas to enter the inlet for releasing flatus gas from the drainage bag to its surroundings, thus providing motivation for such (column 4, lines 52-61; column 5, lines 16-19). Ferguson, at column 7, lines 30-34, discloses that changes and modifications of the ostomy system would be within the skill of one in the art. Petersen, at column 1, lines 24-29 and lines 58-64, teaches that it is known in the art to provide ostomy filters either with drainage bags or with other components such as with the coupling system, thus teaching that ostomy system filters can be provided in other locations in the system and thus providing motivation for such. Petersen, at column 2, lines 23-25 and 40-50, provides motivation to locate the filter where flatus gas can vent to deflate the drainage bag

when the wearer is different positions. As best depicted in Figures 5 and 2 at (28) and column 5, lines 31-39, Petersen teaches filter 36 integrated with coupling system 10 such that filter inlet 28 of the filter 36 is inside the drainage bag, inlet 28 is a hollow gas passage forming duct 30 in open communication with gas inlet openings 32. The examiner notes that an inlet for the filter would necessarily be inside a drainage bag in order for flatus gas inside the bag to enter the inlet of the filter for subsequent evacuation or venting through a downstream gas outlet to its surroundings. The examiner notes that the claimed elements of the instant ostomy system each perform their same function as they had been known to perform with the predictable results of releasing flatus gas from the bag to its surroundings and preventing liquid and solid particles from passing from the bag with the flatus.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the ostomy system of Ferguson to locate the filter integral with the coupling system as taught by Petersen with a reasonable expectation of success since each of the elements perform their known function with no change in their respective functions and since Petersen states, at column 2, lines 30-49, that the benefit of forming an ostomy system with this design is that the filter in the coupling system permits flatus gas to be vented even when the wearer is in sitting or lying down and in other various body positions, and since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70.

**With respect to claim 2**, Ferguson discloses wherein the filter inlet 80 (figs. 6) facing the interior of the drainage bag (column 4, lines 55-61) and flatus gas outlet 36 (fig. 3) faces an interior of the drainage bag and a flatus gas outlet 96 (fig. 6 at arrow) faces the surroundings of

the drainage bag. With respect to the limitation that the filter is folded to provide a folding line that intersects the filter inlet, the examiner notes that the instant filter is only folded by the motions of the wearer when the wearer is sitting down or moving, the filter of Ferguson is capable of performing the substantially identical function when the bag of Ferguson is worn and would also fold at a line that intersects the filter inlet when that portion of the bag is folded in response to wearer movements. See claim 1, *supra*, for detailed analysis of the claimed folding and folding line that is not a structural component of the article but is a result of the flexible bag moving with and in response the wearer's body movements such as bending or sitting. The bag and filter of Ferguson comprises the same materials such as flexible plastic films and bags and compressible foam filters that the instant Specification discloses as suitable embodiments of the instant claimed ostomy system, and thus the examiner has a reasonable basis to contend that that the system of Ferguson would perform the claimed folding function in the substantially identical manner when worn in the same manner. The folding line is considered to be the area of the bag where the bag will fold naturally during body movements and motion of the wearer and is capable of folding at a portion of the bag that intersects the filter inlet. Thus the examiner maintains that the ostomy system of Ferguson performs the claimed function when used in the same manner as the instant bag and thus meets the claim.

**With respect to claim 3**, Ferguson discloses wherein the filter inlet 80 (fig. 6) faces an interior of the drainage bag (column 4, lines 55-61) and flatus gas outlet 36 (fig. 3) faces the surroundings of the drainage bag (column 5, lines 19-22), and the filter is capable of being folded to provide a folding line that intersect the filter at a distance from the inlet. The folding line is considered to be the area of the bag where the bag will fold naturally during body movements

and motion of the wearer and is capable of folding at a portion of the bag that intersects the filter at a distance from the inlet, see claims 1 and 2 supra for detailed analysis of the folding which is not a structural feature of the filter but is a response of the filter to the body movements of the wearer when bending or sitting because the bag and filter will fold naturally during body movements and motion of the wearer.

**With respect to claim 5**, Ferguson discloses the claimed invention except for the filter is arranged between the coupling system and the drainage bag. As best depicted in Figure 5, Petersen discloses the filter 36 is arranged between the coupling system 16 and the drainage bag 40, see claim 1 supra for detailed analysis of the modifying or rearranging the location of the filter of Ferguson as taught by Petersen.

**With respect to claim 6**, Ferguson discloses wherein the drainage bag is impermeable to flatus gases (column 3, lines 31-33).

**With respect to claim 7**, Ferguson discloses the claimed invention except for wherein said surroundings of the drainage bag comprise an outer bag that is secured in relation to the user's body and in relation to the drainage bag by means of said coupling system. Ferguson discloses the filter is located adjacent the coupling system at a location that ensures that the outward flow of flatus gases passes through the filter, thus providing motivation for such (column 1, lines 12-14). Petersen provides motivation for a filter at a location that the outward flow of flatus gas passes through the filter (column 1, lines 13-15).

As best depicted in Figures 2, 3 and 5, Peterson teaches the filter 36 is provided in 34 the coupling system 10 (column 5, lines 42-45); the drainage bag 40 is surrounded by an outer bag 46 which is secured in relation to the patient's body and in relation to the drainage bag by means

of the coupling system (fig. 5; column 7, lines 7-8). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Ferguson with an outer bag as taught by Petersen since Petersen states at column 2, lines 62-68 and at Abstract that such reusable outer bags with inner disposable bag liners are known in the art and that the coupling system of Petersen is suitable for use with both the systems of Ferguson and with reusable systems, thereby providing a more economical ostomy system.

**With respect to claim 9**, Ferguson discloses said passageway 10 (fig. 3; column 4, lines 65-67) further extends through a gas permeable membrane (column 4, lines 14-19).

**With respect to claim 12**, Ferguson discloses the drainage bag is of a structure which essentially maintains its physical integrity upon immersion in water (column 3, lines 31-33; column 7, lines 39-40).

**With respect to claim 13**, Ferguson discloses the claimed invention except for expressly disclosing the coupling system includes means for forcing the flow of flatus gases along a predetermined passageway. Ferguson discloses the filter includes means for forcing the flow of flatus gases along a predetermined passageway through the filter, thus providing motivation for such (column 2, lines 30-35, lines 51-53). Petersen teaches the coupling system 10 includes means 30, 32 for forcing the flow of flatus gases along a predetermined passageway 38 (column 6, lines 11-13; column 2, lines 32-34 and lines 47-48) through the filter. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the coupling system means of Petersen for the system of Ferguson since both means force the flow of flatus gases along a predetermined passageway in the same manner wherein the only difference is the location of the means in the coupling system comprising the filter or in the filter

itself since both locations perform the same function and it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70.

**With respect to claim 14**, Ferguson discloses wherein the at least one filter comprises a plurality of filters 40, 70 (fig. 3); 40, 146 (figs. 9 and 10).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson in view of Petersen and further in view of Broida (US 5,013,307).

**With respect to claim 10**, the combination of Ferguson and Petersen discloses the claimed invention except for wherein the filter comprises a filter flange, and wherein the drainage bag is connected to a first surface of the filter flange along an attachment zone, and wherein the coupling system is connected to the filter flange along a contact area, whereby said attachment zone is radially displaced with respect to said contact area. Ferguson discloses the drainage bag is connected to a first surface of a coupling flange along an attachment zone and coupling area, and the attachment zone is radially displaced with respect to the contact area, thus providing motivation for such. Petersen teaches the filter comprises a filter flange, thus providing motivation for such.

Ferguson discloses the filter is located adjacent the coupling system at a location that ensures that the outward flow of flatus gases passes through the filter; the filter 70 constitutes a filter flange 72 (fig. 3), and wherein the drainage bag is connected to a first surface of the filter flange 72 along an attachment zone (figs. 5 and 6), thus providing motivation for such (column 1, lines 12-14).

Broida, at column 4, lines 23-40, and column 2, lines 20-23 and lines 40-43, teaches that leaks often occur at the top of ostomy flanges where attached to wearer's skin and provides

motivation for an odor absorbing filter arranged between the coupling system and the drainage bag to absorb odor. As best depicted in Figures 2 and 3, Broida teaches filter 10 arranged between coupling system 23 and drainage bag 20 (claim 5); the filter 10 constitutes a filter flange 10, the drainage bag 20 is connected to a first surface of the filter flange 10 along an attachment zone 12, and wherein the coupling system 23 is connected to the filter flange 10 along a contact area A (fig. 3), whereby said attachment zone 12 is radially displaced with respect to said contact area (column 2, lines 20-23). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the filter of Ferguson and Petersen arranged between the coupling system and drainage bag as taught by Broida since both locations perform the same function and it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson in view of Petersen as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Smith et al (US 5,690,622).

**With respect to claim 8**, the combination of Ferguson and Petersen discloses the claimed invention except for a flatus filter for releasing flatus gases from the outer bag. Petersen discloses the outer bag is fabricated from a material that is impermeable to flatus gasses and comprises an outlet for releasing flatus gases from the outer bag, thus providing motivation for such (column 7, lines 39-41), but does not disclose a flatus filter for releasing flatus gases from the outer bag. As best depicted in Figure 2, Smith discloses an outer bag 2 made from a material impermeable to flatus gases and comprises an outlet 18 covered by a flatus filter 19 for releasing flatus gases from the outer bag (column 3, lines 26-27 and line 56 to column 4, lines 1-11). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to provide the filter for the outer bag as taught by Smith for the ostomy system of Ferguson and Peterson since Smith states, at column 4, lines 13-20, that the benefit of forming the system with this design is that flatus that passes from the inner bag to the outer bag is deodorized before passing into the surrounding atmosphere.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson in view of Peterson and further in view of Johnsen et al (US 5,085,652).

**With respect to claim 11**, the combination of Ferguson and Petersen disclose the claimed invention except for the closed cell foam. Ferguson discloses the foam is an open-cell foam and the filter constitutes a filter flange 72 (fig. 3) in which the open cell foam is supported by the flange, thus providing motivation for such. As best depicted in Figure 5, Johnsen teaches the foam 30 is an open-cell foam, the filter 30 constitutes a filter flange 20, in which the open cell foam is supported by a closed cell foam 36 (column 5, lines 43-45 and lines 61-63). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the closed cell foam of Johnsen for the flange of Ferguson and Petersen since Johnsen states at column 5, lines 66-68 to column 6, lines 1-2, that the benefit of forming the filter with this design is that the closed cell foam supports the open-cell foam filter and makes the filter flange easier to handle, apply and remove.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ginger T. Chapman whose telephone number is (571)272-4934. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/591,452  
Art Unit: 3761

Page 16

/Ginger T Chapman/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3761  
02/25/11

/Tatyana Zalukaeva/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit  
3761